

# Northwest Pipe Company

August 14, 2014

Jim Orr, R.G.  
Project Manager  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Northwest Region  
2020 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97201

RE: July 10, 2014 NWP/DEQ Meeting Notes Addressing NWP's Response to July 8, 2014 DEQ  
Comments on Remedial Investigation and Source Control Evaluation Report  
Northwest Pipe Company Portland Plant, ECSI #138

Dear Mr. Orr:

Thank you for meeting with Northwest Pipe Company (NWP), its consultant CH2M HILL, and its attorney Ms. Claudia Powers on July 10, 2014 to discuss the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) comments on NWP's Remedial Investigation and Source Control Evaluation Report (CH2M HILL, January 2014) (Report). As you know, we have carefully evaluated the nearly 55 general and specific comments and recommendations provided by DEQ regarding the Report. During our two hour meeting, we were able to clarify DEQ's comments, provide preliminary feedback to DEQ, and hopefully set the outline for NWP's revisions to the Report.

The enclosed meeting minutes describe our understanding of mutually agreed path forward for each comment, and our understanding of the scope of the task to revise the Report. Despite NWP's continued efforts to expedite this process and present information to DEQ in accordance with the template and requirements of the Joint Source Control Strategy, DEQ's comments will require at least a two to three month level of effort to produce a revised Report. Therefore, if you have any thoughts about, or recall any of the discussions differently than what is reflected in the attached notes, please call me right away.

Again, thank you for your assistance in completing this work.

Sincerely,



Stephanie Heldt-Sheller  
Corporate Environmental Manager  
Northwest Pipe Company

Cc: Alex Liverman, DEQ  
Mike Poulsen, DEQ  
Tim Whitson, NWP  
Claudia Powers, Ater Wynne LLP  
Ken Shump, CH2M Hill  
Kristine Koch, EPA  
Rich Muza, EPA

Enclosure: Meeting minutes from July 10, 2014

**Meeting Notes:**  
**DEQ / CH2M HILL / NW Pipe Co.**

**Location:** DEQ NW Regional offices, Portland, OR

**Date:** 07/10/2014

**Attendees:** Jim Orr, Alex Liverman, Mike Paulson: DEQ  
Stephanie Heldt-Sheller: NW Pipe  
Ken Shump, Bruce Hope: CH2M HILL  
Claudia Powers: Ater Wynne

**Subject:** DEQ 7/10/14 Comments on NWP RI/SCE Report (CH2M HILL, January 2014)

**A. General Discussion of the NWP RI/SCE Report (Report) review process**

- Claudia Powers asked about the relationship between EPA and DEQ comments on the Report and whether DEQ expected Northwest Pipe (NWP) to respond to all of EPA comments as well as those incorporated in the DEQ comments. Jim Orr said he did not expect NWP to respond to the EPA comments except to the extent they are included in DEQ's comments. NWP assumes, therefore, that the EPA comments not incorporated by DEQ into its comments will not affect DEQ's NFA source control determination.
- Significant conversation occurred clarifying that the DEQ comments were crafted with the intent that NWP was pursuing a Site-Wide No Further Action (NFA) Determination. The DEQ stated that the Report is very close to meeting both the Source Control Recommendation needs, as well as the Site-Wide NFA needs, that comments leaned towards NWP getting both with the revised document. NWP agreed to pursue both a Source Control NFA and a Site-Wide NFA to increase efficiencies, but only if the latter did not slow the Source Control determination.

**B. General Comments from DEQ – Led by Ken Shump (KS)**

1. Revisions to the organization/layout of Report – KS explained the report was prepared using the Joint Source Control Strategy (JSCS) template and that a whole-sale revision of the report would be a significant effort. Jim Orr (JO) stated that the current format would be acceptable. DEQ's preference is to make the content more straight-forward, but reformatting the entire Report was not necessary. NWP will consider this preference during the revision process.
2. Regulatory History – KS explained these points are important to NWP and we'd like to include the history, but can shorten this section. JO concurred.
3. Baseline Risk Assessment – JO, Alex Liverman (AL), and Mike Paulsen (MP) all noted the report was very close to meeting the Site-Wide NFA needs, and the Baseline Risk assessment is a required piece for that determination. MP explained the Baseline Risk Assessment would not need to be a stand-alone document, but rather a narrative section (a paragraph or a page) added to the RI/SCE updating the interim remedial action (IRAM) risk analysis. DEQ explained that there is no uncertainty about the protectiveness of the cap or the finality of the actions to implement the IRAM, but that NWP would need to show that the cap is still protective using updated RBCs by comparing the pre-and post-cap soil risk (a residual risk assessment). The missing piece is the calculation of risk without the interim actions (i.e., without the cap). Although this evaluation was provided in previous reports, it needs to be added to the Report so all relevant information is in the Report.
4. Institutional Controls – JO explained that a discussion of Institutional Controls for the Site should be included in the Report. DEQ explained that the Report would be used to obtain a Source Control Decision; then, NWP would enter into an Easement & Equitable Servitude (E&ES) with DEQ and register it with the appropriate county recorder. Because the E&ES runs with the land,

future owners would also be required to abide by the controls, in this case, maintain the site cap and possibly other engineering controls/restrictions. The E&ES is an element of the site remedy DEQ would require to issue a Site-Wide NFA.

5. JO requested that the Report needs to better explain the effectiveness of the cap in the narrative and tables. MP added that the Report should explain that any soil under the cap considered to be a "Hot Spot" pursuant to current regulations may not have been a "Hot Spot" at the time of the interim action.

C. Specific Comments (numbered in the same order as the July 8, 2014 DEQ letter) – Led by KS.

1. Regulatory History - Discussed above at General Comment #2.
2. Stormwater System Investigation - NWP will provide additional information regarding this pipe, explaining that it does not drain stormwater from NWP.
3. The stormwater pump station already is depicted on Figure 2-4 and is labeled as 'Pump/Settling Vault.'
4. Stormwater Treatment System - DEQ clarified that the Report should provide more details on the stormwater filtration system. NWP will provide the system's manual and permit application which contains the requested information, as an appendix to the RI/SCE. This will be addressed in the revision.
5. The Isolated Drainage Zones will be addressed in the revision.
6. Figures 2-4 and 2-5 will be revised.
7. First part of Comment Re: Groundwater Results - JO explained the Report needs to clarify and provide additional information regarding MW-5 groundwater concentrations and to add the points in the text (this could be the upgradient, offsite source). Second Part of the Comment Re: Groundwater Results - Groundwater elevations were compared to site subsurface utilities in the 2005 Draft RI/SCE. This information will be incorporated into the revision. JO stated the more important point is that the concentrations of COCs are decreasing in the down gradient well.
8. Request for Dated Information -- The information requested is very old and irrelevant because it has been superseded by newer information. JO requested NWP to provide what it could on the requested information, if available. If not, it will not be required.
9. Request for Dated Information NWP will add the UST locations, but similar to response to Specific Comment #8, the information is very old and has been superseded by newer information. If available, it will be provided. If not, it will not be required.
10. Request for Dated Information Same as Specific Comment #8.
11. NWP can provide an updated SWPPP map, which also shows when this feature was discontinued. A narrative will be added to clarify.
12. Site Features -- See Specific Comment #11.
13. Baseline Risk Assessment - See General Comment #2.
14. DEQ clarified that its comment here is a request that the Report better describe erosion control BMPs for soil sloughing from an off-site road right-of-way onto NWP property in the Report narrative. NWP will provide further details.
15. DEQ clarified it needs more details in the narrative to support the information that had already been provided in relevant the Table. NWP will provide more details.
16. NWP will provide the permit application for the paving/treatment system, which includes the DEQ-requested hydraulic analysis. Mapping will be updated to show the removal areas, confirmation sample locations, new pavement cap, and any remaining unpaved areas.
17. A citation to the reference for the background arsenic concentration already provided in the reference section will be added as a footnote in the text.
18. Groundwater Recharge & Discharge - See Specific Comment #7.
19. Ecology - DEQ would like the Report to include comments that there is aquatic habitat in the Slip and to include a brief discussion that groundwater transport to the slips would be expected, but

the Report can also discuss the unlikelihood/improbability of COIs at unacceptable levels of concern reaching the slips.

20. This is a baseline risk assessment issue. See General Comment #3.
21. Off-Site Recreational User -- NWP will delete the word "impossible" in this section. See Specific Comment #19.
22. NWP will provide additional narrative explaining why TCE/PCE bioaccumulation is not an issue (use Oakridge numbers).
23. NWP will add a statement concerning risk screening under OAR 340-122-0080(5). This will be addressed in the revision.
24. NWP will include the PCE/TCE numbers with the most recent screening levels in the tables and maps.
25. NWP will address vapor intrusion pursuant to revised agency guidance.
26. TCE/PCE & Groundwater -- See Specific Comment #7.
27. Screening Methodology -- DEQ now takes the position that 175 g/day should be used for fish consumption rate, even though during the NWP/DEQ meeting February 2013 the DEQ directed NWP to use 17.5 g/day. NWP will recalculate the risk exposure pathway using 175g/day for fish consumption rate.
28. NWP will update using current 2012 RBCs.
29. See Specific Comment #19.
30. DEQ clarified the Report should include the possibility of surface water (not groundwater) being drinking water. NWP will distinguish between "surface water" and "groundwater."
31. Eco Risk -- See Specific Comment #19.
32. SLV's -- DEQ prefers the word "highly" be removed from this section. The Report can reiterate the JSCS caution. This will be addressed in the revision.
33. Sediment -- AL explained the Report should provide a discussion regarding the sediment data for this AOPC compared to the RI COI data, and discuss current stormwater levels. Show stormwater is not an issue, omit what was not a NWP COI. NWP can make this change. KS asked if JO could provide the specific sentence/wording in the Report that generated the comment, so NWP can remove it. JO agreed. This will be addressed in the revision.
34. Specific Comments 34 through 38, regarding Inorganic Constituents. This will be addressed in the revision.
39. Groundwater - This was in the 2005 RI/SCE, and can be added to the revision. This will be referenced or summarized in the revision.
40. Stormwater -- See Specific Comment #33.
41. Specific Comments 41 through 49, regarding Additions/Revisions to Tables. These Tables will be addressed in the revision.
50. Figures 6-2 -- DEQ clarified that the Figure should be updated to reflect most recent RBC's and discussion in the narrative should be added. See Specific Comment #19. DEQ clarified the Report should have additional discussion regarding vapor exposure pathway to excavation workers. NWP can provide the 2014 NPDES 1200-Z sampling data, lab method requirements for NPDES sampling, and lab detection info in the revision.

D. Meeting adjourned